

1
2
3
4 **UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**
5 **DISTRICT OF NEVADA**

6 * * *

7 UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,)
8 Plaintiff,)

2:06-CR-00109-PMP-LRL

9 **ORDER**

10 vs.)

11 JOEL K. PARKER,)

12 Defendant.)
13 _____)

14 Before the Court for consideration is Defendant Parker's Pro Se Motion
15 Requesting Dismissal for Lack of Jurisdiction and Standing (Doc. #102) and Motion
16 Requesting Dismissal of the Indictment Due to Duplicity (Doc. #103). Plaintiff
17 United States filed an Omnibus Response (Doc. #108). Having read and considered
18 the foregoing the Court finds that both Motions filed by Defendant Parker in proper
19 person must be denied.

20 Specifically, the record before the Court shows that the alleged victims,
21 Quisenberry and Dillinger, are in fact federal officers or employees for purpose of
22 determining jurisdiction under 18 U.S.C. § 111. Therefore, jurisdiction in this court
23 is appropriate.

24 Additionally, 18 U.S.C. § 111 is not unconstitutionally vague and nothing
25 in the Superseding Indictment is duplicitous. Each of the two counts of the
26 Superseding Indictment charge separate violations of 18 U.S.C. § 111.

